

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are presented for consideration, with Claims 1, 10, 19 and 20 being independent.

Initially, Applicants note with appreciation that Claims 1-4, 7-13 and 15-19 are allowed.

Claims 5, 6 and 14 are presently withdrawn from consideration. It is respectfully submitted, however, that since these claims depend from allowed independent claims (Claims 5 and 6 from Claim 1, and Claim 14 from Claim 10), they should now be considered and allowed.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Yamazaki '241. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 20 relates to an optical system that includes an illumination optical system for guiding illumination light to a reflection type display device, and a projection optical system for guiding image light, reflected by the reflection type display device, to an observer. The illumination optical system includes a first optical member for directing the illumination light toward the reflection type display device, and a second optical member that includes a reflecting surface which deflects a principal optical path of illumination light from a light source and emits the illumination light, reflected by the reflecting surface, toward the first optical member. In accordance with Applicants' claimed optical system, an efficient use of light is provided, thus allowing for a superior image display apparatus.

Initially, Applicants respectfully wish to comment on the remarks in the last paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action. Claim 20 includes an illumination optical system having a first optical member for directing the illumination light toward the reflection type

display device, and a second optical member that includes a reflecting surface which deflects a principal optical path of illumination light from a light source and emits the illumination light, reflected by the reflecting surface, toward the first optical member. An illumination optical system including these same first and second optical members is set forth in Claim 10, as was stated in the Amendment of March 13, 2003. Moreover, the language in Claim 10 that is identified on page 4 of the Office Action in the Statement of Reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter is, in fact, included in Claim 20. Nonetheless, the following detailed comments are set forth to distinguish Claim 20 from Yamazaki.

As previously discussed, the composite display apparatus in Yamazaki includes a display optical system 101, an image pickup optical system 102, and a see-through optical system 103. As understood, the Office Action asserts that the display optical system 101 in Yamazaki corresponds to Applicants' claimed first optical member for directing illumination light toward the reflection type display device, and the image pickup optical system 102 in Yamazaki corresponds to Applicants' claimed second optical member.

In response to these assertions, Applicants respectfully set forth that, as understood, the light from light source 31 would not pass through LCD 2 and ultimately reach CCD 3 as asserted in the Office Action. This is because, as explained in column 6, lines 3-13 of Yamazaki, the polarizing plate provides a polarization axis perpendicular to that of the linearly polarized light from the LCD 2. In this way, light emitted from the LCD 2 is prevented from being incident on the surface of CCD 3. Yamazaki thus fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed first optical member. With respect to Applicants' claimed second optical member, if the image pickup optical system 102 in Yamazaki were considered to be the second optical member, as asserted in the Office Action, illumination light is not reflected by a reflecting surface of the

image pickup optical system 102 toward the display optical system 101, as set forth in Claim 20.


Yamazaki thus also fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed second optical member.

For at least these reasons, it is submitted that Yamazaki fails to render obvious Applicants' invention as set forth in Claim 20. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Scott D. Malpede
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM/vmm

DC_MAIN 141144 v 1